

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: July 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of Jul. 12, 2006

Amendments to the Drawing:

None. The drawing was accepted by the official draftsman in the first Office action.

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: July 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of Jul. 12, 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner's Office action of July 12, 2006, has been carefully considered and is appreciated. Applicant's goal in this Amendment is to place all claims remaining in the application after this Amendment in condition for allowance in accordance with the examiner's direction in the Office action of July 12, 2006. Claims 10, 16 have been canceled in this response. Claims now remaining in the case are 1, 2, 4, 7-9, 12, 13, 17, and 19-25, all of which are believed to be allowable as now presented.

In this regard, editing marks have been removed from the allowed claims, namely 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 25, all of which were previously presented in the Amendment of May 30, 2006.

Claim 12, which was objected to, has been amended by including all the limitations from claim 10, which has been canceled, and the indefinite article "a" has been inserted before the phrase "strip of adhesive: as required in paragraph 4 of the Office action.

Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 12 as amended, thereby providing the required antecedent basis for "said transparent reminder pocket."

Claim 17 has been given considerable attention. Applicant agrees that orientation description is confusing in this matter because the orientation of various parts of the envelope change when it is folded to change it from a flat pattern blank into a completed

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: July 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of Jul. 12, 2006


envelope. Applicant had believed that the phrase "bottom edge of a flat pattern blank" was definite as shown in Fig. 1 and was distinct from the bottom edge of the folded envelope. To overcome the ruled confusion, that phrase has been replaced by a "top edge of the completed and sealed envelope," which is called out as reference character 106 and is first shown in Fig. 2. It is believed that this amendment eliminates any confusion as to orientation of the limitations discussed in the claim.

Claims 19-24 have been presented without editing marks and are believed allowable.

With these amendments, it is believed that all the claims now in the case are now allowable over the prior art of record, which, either alone or in conjunction with each other, neither discloses nor suggests the present invention as now claimed. Therefore speedy allowance of all claims now in the case is requested.

Please call the undersigned attorney at (913) 897-6738 in regard to this application if desired.

Respectfully Submitted,




Kenneth W. Iles
PTO Registration Number 30,395
Attorney for Applicant
Telephone (913) 897-6738
Facsimile (913) 681-0493

Appl. No.: 10/661,393
Amdt. Dated: July 26, 2006
Reply to Office action of Jul. 12, 2006

Kenneth W. Iles
Law Offices of Kenneth W. Iles
9903 West 129th Street
Overland Park, KS 66213-3222

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION (FAXING) UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the Central Facsimile Telephone Number (571) 273-8300 on **JULY 26, 2006**.


Signed: Kenneth W. Iles

Date: 